



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/077,217	02/15/2002	John A. Obermark	501396	3946
23626	7590	02/17/2004	EXAMINER	
LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD			LAMB, BRENDA A	
6815 WEAVER ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ROCKFORD, IL 61114-8018			1734	7

DATE MAILED: 02/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.	10/077,217	Applicant(s)	Obermark
Examiner	LAMB	Group Art Unit	1734

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

Responsive to communication(s) filed on

Paper #8 filed 9/25/03

This action is FINAL.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-45

is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s)

is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) 1-20 and 34-45

is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 21-24, 26 and 33

is/are rejected.

Claim(s) 25 and 27-32

is/are objected to.

Claim(s)

are subject to restriction or election requirement

### Application Papers

The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved.

The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

All  Some\*  None of the:

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received

in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

### Attachment(s)

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Other \_\_\_\_\_

## Office Action Summary

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 21-24, 26 and 33 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2-7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,521,044 (Obermark). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Obermark claims an apparatus for coating a metal strip with laminate comprising the following: a support frame; and a top and bottom roller coater. Obermark claims each of his roller coaters is comprised of an applicator roll adapted to receive and apply laminate, the applicator roll contacting the metal strip at a first contact point while in the engaged position, the applicator roller is driven in rotation by the metal strip while in the engaged position. Obermark teaches his roll coater is further comprised of a pair of supporting engaging the applicator roll in the engaged position at second and third point with the first, second and third contact points being located at different angular positions about the predetermined axis to carry the applicator roll therebetween. Obermark fails to claim the applicator roller is carried without journaling of the application roll in bearing. However, applicant's claim that the

applicator roll is not physically connected to any part of the apparatus would have obviously included the application roll not being journaled in bearings. With respect to claim 22, Obermark claims the upper roll coater is further comprised support means for supporting the bottom of the application roll and retaining the applicator roll to in the upper roll coater. With respect to claim 24, Obermark claims the apparatus include a manifold for supplying laminate to the applicator roll and wherein each roller coater further includes an applicator head having structure scope of claim 24. With respect to claim 26, Obermark claims a control valve, manifold and means for modulating the valve having structure within scope of the claim. With respect to claim 33, Obermark claims the apparatus is situated upstream of the press machine lubricating the metal strip prior to reaching the press machine.

Claims 1-20 and 34-45 are allowed.

Claims 25 and 27-32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Brenda Lamb at telephone number 571-272-1231. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Tuesday and Thursday through Friday with alternate Wednesdays off.

B. Lamb

February 2, 2004

*Brenda A. Lamb*  
BRENDA A. LAMB  
PRIMARY EXAMINER